REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the present application. Claim 12 has been added to recite an additional embodiment of the invention. Claim 12 finds full support at page 12, lines 6 and 16 of the original specification. Thus, there is no issue of new matter.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oka (JP-07-090179) in view of Nalwa (Journal of Materials Science, 26 (1991) p. 1683-1690). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Reconsideratiion and withdrawal thereof are requested.

The Nalwa reference teaches as follows:

"The electrophysical properties of the tetramer deviate from the phenyl-end-capped aniline tetramer, due to structural difference. The present studies demonstrate that magnitude of transport properties is sensitive to the chemical structures" (Cf. **p.1689).**

It is the applicant's position that this teaching does not and cannot motivate a person skilled in the art to cap the end of polyaniline with phenyl groups. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to try end-capping the polyaniline of Oka with phenyl groups.

Further, Oka discloses the following in [0007].

"If a number average molecular weight of polyaniline becomes lower than 2000, the flexibility of a poly- aniline polyamide acid complex salt type precursor and a polyaniline polyimide complex obtained eventually will be spoiled, and it will become difficult to obtain a self-standing film, a fiber, and other molded products."

See also pages 11-12 of the present specification.

Accordingly, there is no teaching, disclosure or suggestion in the cited prior art of adjusting the molecular weight of the polyaniline of Oka to below 2,000. In this regard, Nalwa only teaches tetraaniline having a number average molecular weight of 366, so that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Nalwa with Oka.

Thus, those skilled in the art would not be able to foresee the inventive varnish and the advantageous effect thereof from the teachings of Oka and Nalwa, whether considered alone or in combination.

Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oka (JP-07-090179) in view of Nalwa (Journal of Materials Science, 26 (1991) p. 1683-1690) and Kin (JP-11-185962). This rejection is also traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are requested.

The Kin reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Oka and Nalwa references and does not teach that the claimed invention is obvious to one skilled in the art, whether the references are considered alone or in combination. Simply stated, there is no teaching, disclosure or suggestion in the prior art of the invention recited in claims 1-12 in the present application.

Therefore, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action to this effect is requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Raymond C. Stewart, Registration No. 21,066 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: May 3, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Raymond C. Stewart

Raymond C. Stewart
Registration No.: 21,066
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000